

Minutes
PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD
August 28, 1979

The Parks and Recreation Board met for its regular meeting at 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, August 28, 1979, at the Parks and Recreation Department. Present were Mr. Hall, Vice Chairman; Mr. Shaw, Secretary; and members Mrs. Arnold, Mr. Bray, Mr. Britton, Miss Dominguez, Mrs. Isely, Mr. Nalle and Mr. Ramos. Members absent were Mr. Garrison, Chairman; Mr. Coffee and Ms. Doering. Member Emeritus present was Mrs. Crenshaw and Member Emeritus absent was Mr. Coates. Staff members present included Leonard Ehrler, Roy Guerrero, Don Cramer, David Reed, Randy Russell, Bob Delaney, Donna Brasher, Preston Wheeler, Dennis Nagao, Linda Tyler and Louise Nivison. Visitors included Lee Kelly, Austin American-Statesman; Caroline and Robert Brandt; Tom Henry, Holiday Inns, Inc.; Campbell McGinnis; Richard Lindley; Sally Kelz, Daily Texan; Marjorie and Cliff Carlson; Starr and Billie Keller, J. L. Brown, Charles and Judy Salerno, Mary Ashford, Lalonie Rose, Roxie Vencent, Marceda VanPelt, Nancy Jones, Angie Mishoe, Barbara Bishop, Angie Jones, Nancy Size and Gurnet Bowden, Dottie Jordan Recreation Center Advisory Board; Steve Hanson, Sierra Club; Bill Martin, President of the Balcones Civic Association; and Agnes Edwards, Hyde Park Neighborhood Association.

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m., by Mr. Hall, Vice Chairman.

Mr. Hall asked for approval of the minutes of July 24, 1979. It was moved by Mrs. Isely and seconded by Mr. Britton that the minutes be approved as printed. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hall asked for approval of the minutes of August 13, 1979. It was moved by Mr. Britton and seconded by Mrs. Arnold that the minutes be approved as printed. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hall welcomed Mrs. Crenshaw and asked if she would like to comment at this time. Mrs. Crenshaw stated that she had no comments at the present time but would like to speak to some of the items on the agenda later.

HOLIDAY INNS, INC. REQUEST FOR USE OF PARKLAND ON TOWN LAKE FOR PARKING

Mr. Tom Henry, A.I.A., Regional Architect for Holiday Inns, Inc., stated that he was pleased to be able to appear before the board to review their proposals. The critical issue was the utilization of parkland by Holiday Inns for supplemental parking and how the issue relates to the present and long term development of Town Lake. The Holiday Inns market study done approximately three years ago indicated that Austin was a very viable market and there was a need for more hotel rooms and facilities to serve them. Results of the study showed a need for 175 additional rooms making a total of 350; providing convention and banquet facilities for 300 and establishing food and beverage facilities to serve this need. The severe on-site parking requirements imposed by the City of Austin required them to inquire about the purchase or lease of property contiguous to them. In order to provide the 450 parking spaces required by the City, proposing a parking garage would necessitate a 5-story parking garage at a cost of \$5,000 per stall, totaling \$1.6 million. The logical place for such a building would be on the corner and would overlook the rooms which would not be a desirable situation. The cost of such a parking facility

was too great for them. After their initial request on May 14, 1979, they have been working very closely with Mr. David Reed, Superintendent of Planning for the Parks and Recreation Department, and his staff.

In Proposal A, in their design planning they tried to enhance and further the utilization of Town Lake for recreation as a focal point; to physically tie together parkland development in such a way as to be more compatible with the Holiday Inn facilities, and to provide supplemental parking for the Holiday Inn and the public. With the idea of furthering and advancing utilization, together with the Parks and Recreation Department staff, they took a look at the park road and analyzed it to see what it really did to the parkland. From a basic design standpoint it allowed the person in the area to traverse and come through parkland, but also separated the potential use from the users. As a design solution they sought to create something that would be a terminus for parking so that people could park and go in whatever direction they so chose. They also tried to identify the area as parking, public or private. They also tried to make massive landscaping attempts to relate back to the topography. The land is also in the flood plain. They wanted to give back to Austin in the form of basic amenities something that possibly they would be giving to the Holiday Inn. They re-addressed the hike and bike trail to have it wind through the highly landscaped property and terminate at a point where a recreational transportation node could be put and function as an information and interpretive center. This was done in response to the desire of the Urban Transportation Department for increased activity of the stern wheel boat operating on Town Lake using this area as a stopover point. They also addressed the need of the Parks and Recreation Department for an interpretive-information center. This could be a place to distribute information concerning the history of Town Lake, etc. In return for the use of the designated area, Holiday Inns would intensify the landscaping in the area and continue the irrigation system to the interpretive center, as well as being responsible for the paving of the parking area and also landscaping. Proposal A would eliminate the park road in the designated area only.

Proposal B had basically the same amenities. The park road would stay and continue through the parkland so as not to preclude another viable alternative. Mr. Henry stated that Proposal A was the plan that both Holiday Inns and the Parks and Recreation Department staff felt would be best. Holiday Inns goals were to be a part of Austin for a long time, and by being a part of Austin they wanted to show their good faith in the development of the parkland and contribute to its enhancement. Holiday Inns would like to request the following from the Parks and Recreation Board:

1. Approval and recommendation for use of parkland as supplemental parking for Holiday Inns.
2. Approval and recommendation of one or the other of the design proposals submitted on a concept basis, details of which would be refined and worked out with the Parks and Recreation Department staff.
3. Support and recommendation of a resolution to the Board of Adjustment for a minimum parking variance of 125 cars to soften the design impact of parking on Austin Town Lake for this development.

Mr. Henry thanked the board for allowing him to make the presentation on behalf of Holiday Inns, Inc. Mr. Hall thanked Mr. Henry and asked if any of the board members had questions. Mrs. Arnold asked Mr. Henry how he would answer the points raised by Mr. Campbell McGinnis of his family having property for sale in the area that can be used for parking purposes. Mr. Henry stated that they have negotiated with Mr. McGinnis for a period of time, but negotiations could not be culminated because of the price of the land and a lease agreement that they did not feel they could live with. Also, the property is not contiguous to the Holiday Inn property. The McGinnis property is bordered by East San Marcos and Flores Streets, and for them to utilize the property from a liability and insurance standpoint they would have to apply for the closing of the two streets so that the property could become contiguous. He did not know how this would affect the traffic in that area and the economic feasibility made it impossible for Holiday Inns to consider the McGinnis property. Mr. Bray asked if the conceptual plan shown was worked out with the Parks and Recreation Department staff. Mr. Henry stated yes and they felt very comfortable with the proposals as presented. Mr. Bray asked if Holiday Inns have been able to determine how long they would need the parkland for parking. Mr. Henry stated that they did not address that subject. This would have to be addressed, if approved, in the lease agreement with the City of Austin. Mrs. Arnold asked how many parking spaces the Holiday Inn currently has on the site. Mr. Henry stated that they have 202. Mrs. Arnold asked how many parking spaces would the City require them to have. Mr. Henry explained the City requirement was 450 parking spaces. There was further discussion concerning the parking areas. Mr. Bray asked the difference between Proposal A and Proposal B. Mr. Henry explained that Proposal A would eliminate the park road in the proposed area and Proposal B would leave the park road as is.

Mrs. Crenshaw asked if the parkland in question was in the Sandy Beach Reserve. David Reed stated that it was. Mrs. Crenshaw explained the property was donated by the State of Texas and was to be used for park and recreation purposes only. Mr. Bray asked if there were deed restrictions. Mrs. Crenshaw stated there would be if it was the Sandy Beach Reserve. Mr. Henry read a memorandum from Mr. Albert De La Rosa, Assistant City Attorney, City Law Department, that was written to Jim Miller, Assistant City Manager, regarding the Sandy Beach Reserve. Mr. Nalle asked that the memorandum be a part of the minutes.

"Sandy Beach Reserve - Holiday Inn TO: Jim Miller, Assistant City Manager

This memorandum is submitted pursuant to your request for a legal opinion on the possibility of allowing Holiday Inn to make use of a portion of the Sandy Beach Reserve for parking lot purposes.

It is quite clear that the City Council may not, because of the prohibition stated in Article II, Section 4, of the City Charter, lease any portion of the Sandy Beach Reserve to the Holiday Inn for use as a parking lot. However, I can also conclude that the City Council clearly may allow Holiday Inn to make use of the subject land as a parking lot, so long as the agreement for such use does not convey an estate in the land and does not purport to transfer exclusive possession of the premises to Holiday Inn.

A Texas case, Hayden v. City of Houston, 305 S.W.2d 798 (Tex. Civ. App. - Fort Worth, 1957, writ refused, n.r.d.), held that a written instrument executed by City and a private firm, wherein the private firm would operate airport parking

"lots was not a lease, despite its having been referred to as same by the parties, and as denominated in the instrument. The Court so held that the instrument was no more than a license 'with reference to a certain use of the City's real estate, and directed to a means of having the...lot...operated for a desired public purpose by (a)...Contractor rather than by the City.' at 801. The Court went further to say that the agreement did not constitute an alienation of the property and 'did not pass an estate in the land, as (is) essential to contracts of lease or sale.' The instrument did not confer 'exclusive possession of the premises as a whole, or any particular portion thereof, as against the whole world, including the City itself....'

Insofar as the proposed use by Holiday Inn is concerned, it is clear that so long as the license agreement makes it clear that a leasehold estate is not being created, the City Council may authorize Holiday Inn to make use of a portion of the Sandy Beach Reserve for a parking lot. Such an agreement would have to make it quite clear that the public would be allowed to make use of the parking lot, and that the Holiday Inn could not have any exclusive right to make use of the lot, and that the Holiday Inn could not reserve any set number of parking spaces for its own exclusive use. The bottom line, however, is that the City Council may allow Holiday Inn to make use of this piece of property, even in the light of the Charter provision mentioned earlier.

A public hearing, as required by Article 5421q, V.T.C.S., is required on this matter, however. The tract of land which we are dealing with is clearly park land, and the necessary hearings must be had before the City Council.

If I can provide additional information, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert DeLaRosa, Assistant City Attorney

April 10, 1979"

Mrs. Crenshaw stated that she felt there seemed to be considerable confusion between the Parks and Recreation Board policies and the City of Austin policies. If the City has a policy of a certain number of parking spaces for private enterprise she did not feel they should come back to the Parks and Recreation Board and ask them to deliberately infringe on their policy. From long experience, she can assure everyone that whatever it costs to park cars is not as valuable and will not cost as much in the long run as the value of parkland will be in the future. She hopes the Parks and Recreation Board will stand firm in supporting their policy on the use of parkland. Mr. Bray stated that he supported Mrs. Crenshaw's opinion and as he understood the legal opinion, even if the land was approved for parking under a lease agreement, if the City so chose the area could be returned to a park site the day after the parking lot was completed. If the City is to do anything it probably should be done on the basis of variance, that is, that the Code requirements for parking is not applicable to this development, just as the Driskill Hotel, Stephen F. Austin Hotel and other downtown structures where the City has waived the parking requirements. The Holiday Inn is offering available improvements to parkland that would be complimentary to what the Parks and Recreation Department otherwise would and should do in an overall development scheme. What is being asked is for the Holiday Inn to make some improvements that would compliment their development and compliment the parks program, if, the City Council thinks that parking requirements are not applicable to the development.

Mr. Hall explained there were other citizens wishing to speak to the issue and he wanted to make them aware of the board's policy of allowing one person three minutes or a group 10 minutes. Mr. Richard Lindley stated that he wanted to thank the board for the opportunity to speak and was present to speak on behalf of the friends of Susan Lucas. Ms. Lucas died five years ago and was a young school teacher. A number of her friends gave money for Town Lake Beautification as a memorial to her. Willow, Cypress and Red Bud trees were selected to be planted at a site near the Holiday Inn. Mr. Lindley commented on the Town Lake Beautification Project and that everyone who participated in the program has a very definite interest in what happens to parkland. He was present to ask that the Parks and Recreation Board reject the request of the Holiday Inns to use parkland for a parking lot. He would also like to remind the board that of all the parkland that the City owns there is very little with a shoreline for all citizens to enjoy.

Mr. Steve Hanson stated that he represented the Austin Regional Group of the Sierra Club. He felt the presentation was very interesting and there was potential in the plans, but this particular land was still dedicated parkland. His personal opinion was that more negotiations should take place between the Holiday Inns and the McGinnis family. Although he is not an attorney he felt the legal opinion from the Law Department was a little shakey. He did agree that the City requirement for parking spaces was excessive. Governor Stevenson gave the Sandy Beach Reserve to the City of Austin from the State of Texas in 1945 to be used as parkland. Mrs. Arnold asked about mention of use of a nearby median strip for parking purposes. Mr. Hanson stated that the area is where the park road narrows near East Avenue. The property runs for a good city block and is City-owned land and not dedicated parkland. Approximately 250 parking spaces could be placed on the property even though the hotel would have to transport their patrons in carts. The property next to the Holiday Inn on the north side is a Gulf station and possibly this property could be secured. He felt the Holiday Inn should look at other alternatives.

Mr. Campbell McGinnis stated that he was present to represent the McGinnis family. The Holiday Inn was proposing to use approximately 700 feet of frontage along Town Lake for parking lot development. Mr. McGinnis stated that he was appearing before the board as a citizen although he did have direct financial interests. His family was very much opposed to the use of parkland for private purposes. The legal opinion presented earlier did not deal with the fact that the deed to the land was for dedicated parkland for the use of the public. The proposal presented by Holiday Inns would benefit them only. He felt that the approval of the Holiday Inns request in any form sets a policy precedent that parkland is available to any landowner with property abutting the park. The parkland is very valuable and the Town Lake Greenbelt is used extensively. If the board sets a policy precedent that allows abutting landowners to use parkland what do you intend to do when I come before you and say that I want to use that parkland for the same purpose, or some other landowner a little farther down wants to do the same thing. Park facilities, available for the public, exists in several places along the park road. The Holiday Inn has other alternatives for parking purposes. The East Avenue City-owned land can be used. Another alternative would be to use the property that the McGinnis family owns. Approximately seven years ago Holiday Inns came to the McGinnis family and asked for a price for the land they owned. They made an offer, but it was not acceptable and Holiday Inns did not inform them of this. The next year they came back and asked for an offer. We

informed them the offer was still the same. The McGinnis family proposed to City Council earlier a proposal to construct a hotel facility on their land. They would like for their customers to have a view of the parkland. He wanted to urge the Board to again reject the request of the Holiday Inns to use dedicated parkland for parking purposes. Mrs. Arnold asked how many parking spaces the Sheraton Crest Hotel has and the difference in what is required for the Holiday Inn. She thought there might be a variance because of the Sheraton Crest being in the downtown area.

Mr. J. L. Brown stated that he was from the University Hills area of the city and as a member of the Jordan Recreation Center Advisory Board was interested in park usage. If the Holiday Inns should be granted use of parkland for parking purposes and completes the development, who would assume the maintenance of the area. Mr. Ehrler explained the maintenance would be a contractual agreement. Mr. Ehrler explained the charge from the City Council to the Parks and Recreation Department was to aid the Holiday Inns in establishing a standard to design; make sure it would be accessible to public use; and have some redeeming feature that would be beneficial to parkland by virtue of a gift, endowment, design, etc. With these criteria in mind the Parks and Recreation Department Planning Section staff met with Holiday Inns architects and encouraged them to use standards that would show the least impact to the use of parkland. David Reed stated that his staff tried to recognize the sensitivity of the issue. They worked with the Holiday Inns personnel to assist them as best they could to come up with a solution that would speak to additional park use of the waterfront, but at the same time give assistance to the Holiday Inns. He wanted to point out a design problem that is presently on Town Lake. If the Parks and Recreation Department had to design that part of Town Lake over again they would do it differently. In working with the private sector there could be more linkage along the waterfront where better recreation services could be provided. In the design process they treated the park road as a barrier because it is a barrier between the waterfront and the Holiday Inn. Neither of the proposals spoke to the exclusive use of the area by the Holiday Inn. They made certain this was recognized. By putting in an interpretive center the story of Town Lake could be told. The Town Lake Hike and Bike Trails are recognized nationally. The Hyatt-Regency Hotel proposed to be constructed on the property where Christie's Restaurant used to be, came up against the same parking restrictions. The Environmental Board asked City Council for a parking variance. The Holiday Inn is just outside the boundaries of the Downtown Redevelopment District and does not fall under the parking district that could have a variance. The Holiday Inn recognizes that even if a variance was granted they would still have parking problems.

Parks and Recreation Department staff contacted the Urban Transportation Department to see if terminating the park road in the area would impact the general area. They were told that it would not. Of course the Downtown Redevelopment Plan proposes that more hotels be constructed within the district. The staff did their best to encourage the Holiday Inn not to violate the quality and integrity of Town Lake. Mr. Bray asked which proposal the Parks and Recreation Department staff would recommend. Mr. Reed explained that if the staff had to choose they would recommend Proposal A. Mr. Bray asked how much land could be reclaimed by closing the park road in the area. Mr. Ehrler stated that it would be just the length and width of the road in the proposed area. After further discussion, it was moved by Mr. Nalle and seconded by Mrs. Isely, that the Parks and Recreation Board recommend to the Mayor and City Council

denial of the request of the Holiday Inns, Inc., for approval of a City lease agreement for the utilization and development of parkland for supplemental parking along Town Lake in the Sandy Beach Reserve area. The motion carried with Mr. Nalle, Miss Dominguez, Mr. Shaw, Mrs. Isely, Mrs. Arnold, Mr. Britton and Mr. Ramos voting yes, and Mr. Bray voting no. Mr. Hall, Vice Chairman, did not vote. Mr. Garrison, Mr. Coffee and Ms. Doering were absent.

Mrs. Arnold explained that she appreciated what Mr. Reed said very much and agreed that the design criteria developed was very sensitive to the linking of development with Town Lake, and they would have to be thinking in the future of the whole greenbelt and how to work with development occurring next to it. That did not address the primary issue of diverting the use of parkland for other purposes, and the board should uphold their policy for the use of parkland. Mr. Nalle explained that he felt Mr. Reed and his staff did an excellent job. Mr. Bray stated that he felt the Parks and Recreation Department staff and Holiday Inns, Inc., both needed to be complimented on their attempt to address the concerns for Town Lake. He wanted to point out to the board that the final decision would be made by City Council. Certainly the work that went into the proposals could be useful. If the City Council did choose to overrule the recommendation of the board, they needed to know how to go about doing that and the proposals presented were a very important piece of work. If the City Council did overrule the board, he hoped they addressed the policy that Mrs. Crenshaw brought up and that was the policy of whether the parking was necessary for the overall development. If it was not appropriate, then parkland should not be used for that purpose. The reason for his no vote was because this is a nice complimentary development for the Town Lake area and he did not believe it was inconsistent for development to be associated with parkland. The Hyatt-Regency was addressing parkland in their development and he did not feel it quite fair to suggest that this development would be solely for the benefit of the Holiday Inns. Certainly the public would be using the area also. The City Council might look at this differently than the board from a policy point of view, and he hoped that if they do they will keep in mind this point, that if the parking is really necessary we should not be looking at parkland at all and if it is not, then the sensitive concerns brought into play by the proposals submitted are concerns that we should have. Mrs. Arnold stated that at the same time this is looking at just one tiny piece of Town Lake and she would like to encourage the City Council to consider all of Town Lake. This would be a precedent setting action and you needed to consider what other areas of Town Lake would be affected.

PROPOSED ALCOHOL ORDINANCE FOR PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT FACILITIES

Mr. Ehrler explained that as a result of input from citizens, and the Dottie Jordan Recreation Center Advisory Board, the Parks and Recreation Department staff asked the Law Department staff to draft a proposed ordinance regulating the possession, consumption and sale of alcoholic beverages in Parks and Recreation Department facilities. In some park areas where there are recreation centers and recreation programs the consumption of alcohol has become quite a problem. An ordinance would enable police officers and park rangers to enforce the regulations. Mr. Nalle asked if this applied to rental facilities such as the Zilker Clubhouse. Mr. Ehrler stated that under the proposed ordinance consuming alcohol would not be permitted. Mr. Nalle asked about Zilker Hillside. Mr. Ehrler explained the proposed ordinance specifies it would not be allowed within 100 feet of the entire hillside facility. Mrs. Crenshaw suggested that the boundaries be defined between picnic areas and the Zilker

Hillside Theatre, and signs put up informing the public of where beer can and cannot be consumed. Mr. Ehrler explained the public would certainly have to be educated by putting up signs. Mr. Britton asked if a particular building has been used for different club activities for years would it fall under the ordinance and be restricted. Mr. Ehrler stated that it would. Mr. Britton stated that the Doris Miller Auditorium has been used for years for rental purposes for use by various clubs. Mr. Ehrler stated that if it was a Parks and Recreation Department building and fell within the definitions spelled out in the ordinance, alcohol would be prohibited. Mr. Ramos stated that there would be a big problem with the softball complexes. Mr. Ehrler explained players on the field cannot drink, but people sitting in the bleachers could consume alcohol. Mr. Shaw stated that he felt some were being penalized and asked if the staff has thought of exceptions. Mr. Ehrler explained the staff has not considered exceptions, but this could be something that the City Council might direct them to do. Mr. Ramos asked about Aqua Festival. Mr. Ehrler explained that a lot of activities take place on Parks and Recreation Department facilities by City Council action. Activities such as landing a sea plane on Town Lake, ski tournaments on Town Lake, etc., for Aqua Festival have to be approved by City Council. Such an ordinance would give the police officers or park rangers an opportunity to enforce the law where there are problems. Mr. Britton asked if the ordinance could include the consumption or sale of beer by special permission in the rental facilities. Mr. Ehrler explained that for any non-profit organization to sell beer for fund-raising activities on Parks and Recreation Department property now, they have to secure City Council permission. Mr. Nalle stated that the ordinance prohibiting motor boats on Town Lake specifies special permission has to be secured from City Council to allow motor boats on Town Lake. A special permission clause can be inserted in this proposed ordinance. There was further discussion and Mr. Hall asked if there was an ordinance covering disorderly conduct presently in effect. Mr. Ehrler stated that there is one in effect. Mr. Bray stated that in the proposed ordinance it was not a question of disorderly conduct, but whether or not you had the alcohol with you and was consuming it. Mr. Guerrero stated that the department certainly needed the support and help of the board. One of the reasons an alcohol ordinance has not been attempted before was because of all the exceptions. There are three main areas where help is needed and that is recreation centers, swimming pools, and inside athletic fields. One difficulty would be where it says, "everywhere there are activities." This would affect the playgrounds because there are so many picnic areas adjacent to the playground area. Right now it is a mockery for Parks and Recreation Department staff to call police or park rangers when they are having problems at the recreation centers, etc., because there is not an ordinance. Probably the Doris Miller Auditorium, Zaragosa Park, Zilker Clubhouse, Fiesta Gardens and other rental facilities needed to be exempted, but there was a need to start somewhere and changes could always be made later if needed.

Roxie Vincent from the Dottie Jordan Recreation Center Advisory Board explained the ordinance was initiated at the request of the board. It was not the intent for the ordinance just to benefit the Jordan Center and park, but to benefit all other Parks and Recreation Department facilities. Mr. J. L. Brown stated that he was a member of the Jordan Advisory Board and Mr. Clay Strange, Assistant City Attorney, did meet with them at one of their regular meetings, and their areas of concern were discussed. Ms. Agnes Edwards from the Hyde Park neighborhood spoke of the litter problems in the parks and felt this problem is just as big as disorderly conduct. Col. Keller stated that he lived just across

the street from the Dottie Jordan Recreation Center and he would like to address the parking lot and basketball area problems. Initially small boys played basketball and it was a community affair. In the past 60 days he has counted to 50-60 people on the parking lot at one time. There is no room for cars and the entrance into the parking lot is blocked. They are not playing basketball, but are bringing cases of beer, bottles of whiskey, bottles of wine and opening the doors of their cars and turning on the radios full blast. This can be heard for three and four blocks away and goes on all night long. At about 2:00 a.m. they climb over the fence to the pool and go swimming. They bring stereos and radios and plug them into the outlets on the outside of the recreation building. These are not teenagers, but grown men with their girlfriends. Actions such as this brings on the use of dope and across the street from his house is one of the largest beer parlors and rowdy places in the State of Texas. They pay no attention to signs posted or curfew hours, and are laying all over the park in the mornings. Col. Keller thanked the board for allowing him to speak.

Mrs. Arnold asked if there is a noise ordinance. Mr. Ehrler explained there is a noise ordinance, but in order to enforce it an officer must come out and monitor the noise in decibels. Nancy Size from the Dottie Jordan Recreation Center Advisory Board explained that she would like to emphasize the need for some measure of control. The parking lot is overrun by persons consuming alcohol. Mrs. Arnold stated that she would like to hear about what has been done about the problem. Col. Keller explained the police were tired of having them call, and one policeman certainly would not approach a crowd of 50 or 60 when there is really no ordinance to back them up. The situation also presented the problem of drunk drivers. A lady from the West Austin Park area stated the same thing goes on in this park and beer bottles are broken on the play equipment. As a result many children cut their feet on glass. Mr. Bowden from the Dottie Jordan Park area stated that he wanted to point out that the drinking starts by mid-afternoon. This deprives small children the use of the park. Angie Jones from the Dottie Jordan Park area stated that she has called the police on three occasions this summer. The police have been prompt in coming out, but the persons doing the drinking hear on their radios the police calls and disappear before the police can get to the park. After the police leave they all come back. Mr. Ehrler explained that after 2:00 a.m., the park rangers are off duty and it becomes the responsibility of the Police Department to make the calls. The Parks and Recreation Department has a very good working relationship with the Police Department. Mr. Hall and other members of the board asked that the Parks and Recreation Department staff identify the different facilities and place on the agenda as an item for action at the September meeting.

PROPOSED PURCHASE OF PARK SITE ON NORTH BANK OF THE COLORADO RIVER

Mr. David Moriarty stated that he was present to speak to the board concerning the possible purchase of property on the north bank of the Colorado River from just west of Shady Lane eastward to the Montopolis Bridge. The land is in the flood plain and is very unique. He felt the area could be developed with the same wide range of activities and facilities as Zilker Park. Safe facilities for fishing, canoeing, sailing and in the not-too-distant future, roped off areas for wading and swimming in a natural setting could be provided at little cost. Nearer the Montopolis Bridge (as well as under it and on the east side of it) are clearer, flatter areas where playing fields, scenic picnic areas, lovely sites for large activities and community gatherings,

food and drink concessions, an elaborate playground for children, and perhaps a miniature train or pony ride could be placed. In addition, with little expense or effort, the new park could be joined to the wonderful system of hike-and-bike trails which now ends at Longhorn Dam. Since writing the letter in the board agenda, bulldozers have moved in and are making cul-de-sacs on the upper portion of the land. The industry that may go there might not be compatible with a park. Examples of some of the industries there now right along the river are a tire warehouse, welding shop, chicken factory, and a junk shop. A lot of people use the area to swim, fish and picnic now. Mrs. Arnold asked how many acres were involved. Mr. Ehrler stated that it was slightly more than 50 acres. Mr. Bray asked the price of the land. David Reed stated that we do not have a price at the present time but felt sure that it would be very high. Mr. Hall asked if it was too late to purchase the property if they were already bulldozing cul-de-sacs. David Reed stated that the Planning staff spends one day per week reviewing proposed subdivision plats. This property is owned by CenTex and he felt this was something that we should have caught earlier, but in the final stages of the plat reviews staff did meet with the owners and asked that the City be given first option to purchase land for a greenbelt before any property was sold. Half of the property is in the 25-year flood plain. Mrs. Isely asked if this was in the Capital Improvements Program. David Reed stated that it was. Mr. Bray asked if the owner has been approached about the possibility of donating greenbelt land in the 25-year flood plain. David Reed stated that they have not, but it really was a question of being late as it was already platted; of high value and it would take a lot of money to purchase. Mr. Bray stated that he felt half of the property is in the 25-year flood plain, and possibly that could be donated. If the owners were contacted they might be willing to dedicate a scenic and access easement to the tract which would give you free use of one-half of the property without disturbing any of the front-end costs of the subdivision. Mrs. Arnold stated that if the greenbelt should be donated perhaps the money allocated in the C. I.P. could be used to develop the area.

David Reed explained nothing can be built in the 25-year flood plain and we need to think more about approaching landowners about dedications and easements rather than outright ownership. Nash-Phillips-Copus has outright given the City portions of Walnut Creek in the 25-year flood plain because they could not build on it. Mr. Bray asked if the one-half in the 25-year flood plain itself could be developed as a meaningful addition to the park plan. By developed he meant putting in picnic areas. Mr. Ehrler explained the greenbelt could be used for passive recreation. Mr. Bray stated that he would like to see the Parks and Recreation Department staff pursue the matter. Mr. Ehrler stated that David Reed and his staff were trying to encourage the Property Management Department to broaden their scope of methods of acquisition. Mr. Bray stated that he felt this should be coupled with incentives to make it more attractive for developers, and he would like to work with the Parks and Recreation Department staff on this particular project. Mr. Ehrler explained it was not so much working with the staff as working with the Property Management Department. The Parks and Recreation Department can only make the initial contact. Mr. Bray stated that there should be no objection if the land could be donated. Mrs. Crenshaw stated that she would like to suggest that a committee be appointed to negotiate for the property in question. She felt that eventually there will be another dam in that area and Town Lake would need to be extended. The City owns the property on the south side of the river in this area. This should also be put into the master plan. She felt the incentives are there and it is just a matter of talking with the landowners properly. Mr. Ehrler

explained that the staff can approach the landowners but could not negotiate. After further discussion, it was agreed by the board that Mr. Bray and any other member of the board interested, would work with the Parks and Recreation Department staff in pursuing the purchase of the land.

BARTON CREEK/ZILKER PARK LAND ACQUISITION REPORT

Mr. Ehrler explained that the Barton Creek/Zilker Park Land Acquisition Report would be presented to City Council on Thursday. Mr. Ramos asked if land acquisition in this area would have any affect on monies to be used for other land acquisition. Mr. Ehrler stated that the Parks and Recreation Department has asked for additional monies for this purpose. City Council proposes to place this in a bond election. Mr. Bray asked about the archeological site. David Reed explained the site goes from Zilker Park all the way to Lost Creek. The Urban Transportation Department proposed a road through the property belonging to Wilbur Foster and the Parks and Recreation Department has expressed an objection to this. Staff has met with all the major property owners, and felt they have established credibility with them. Mr. Foster came into the office this morning and offered to lease the property to the City for one year and then purchase it at a later date. Property Management Department has not been able time-wise and staff-wise to contact and meet with the landowners and he felt it extremely important for the Parks and Recreation Department staff to meet with these people and see what problems they might have. They were trying to establish a partnership, and if we cannot be good friends we should be able to be good neighbors. If we want public use of the greenbelts we have to purchase the property or it can be dedicated. He felt it was the responsibility of staff to work with engineers and planners of proposed development along Barton Creek and make them aware of the sensitivity of the entire Barton Creek Watershed. The board unanimously endorsed the report.

PROPOSED PARK SITE ON STECK AVENUE

Mr. Robert Brandt stated that he and his wife Caroline, were present to oppose the purchase of land for a proposed park in Steck Valley which presently terminates Steck Avenue at Adirondack. The Urban Transportation Roadway Plan proposed to extend Steck Avenue to Loop 360 as a main artery to carry traffic through the neighborhood. If the Steck Avenue extension does not go through it would mean the established residential streets of Mountain Ridge and Wildridge would be used as main arteries to Loop 360. This would create an overall safety problem for the people living in the neighborhoods, most importantly the children; would destory two neighborhoods and have a serious effect on surrounding neighborhoods. They certainly were not opposed to parks. The terrain in this area is very steep and development costs could be tremendous. The petition submitted with 307 names represented people who would support the extension of Steck Avenue to Loop 360. Mrs. Brandt spoke in support of extending Steck Avenue. Mr. Ehrler explained that developers in the northwest area of the city have refused to sell the City land for a park. The developers did not increase the price of their land, but just simply refused to sell for a park site. The Steck Avenue property was proposed by the Balcones Civic Association and if it becomes unavailable there would be no property in the area that could be used for a park site. There was one other site, but it has been purchased for street right-of-way. Mr. Ehrler explained if the extension was planned it did not appear in the C.I.P. for the Urban Transportation Department for the next

five years. Mr. Bray stated that this was so the developer could be forced to build the road. Mr. Brandt asked Mr. Ehrler if he really felt this area was a good place for a park. Mr. Ehrler stated that it was the only place left for a park. Mr. Reed explained a survey was done in the neighborhood by a neighborhood group and the survey results showed a passive park was wanted. Mrs. Brandt stated that many of the people who had signed their petition were members of the Balcones Civic Association. Mr. Bill Martin stated that he was President of the Balcones Civic Association. The association mailed out 550 questionnaires not only to their members but to other neighborhoods in the northwest area, inquiring about what kind of recreation facilities they would like to have. The results were: (1) hike and bike trails; (2) swimming pool; (3) picnic areas and (4) tennis courts. There are 6,000 people living in their neighborhood. Mr. Bray asked about the boundaries. Mr. Martin stated that the area was bounded on MoPac on the east; HW-183 on the northwest; Loop 360 on the south and Spicewood Springs Road. His association did conduct five public hearings on the neighborhood plan over three years. The public hearings were well publicized and they felt everyone in the area had been made aware of the meetings. If there was a conflict with the proposed park site they certainly would be willing to go back and review other alternatives. This particular site was the only one available in the 680 acre area they represented. Mr. Ehrler stated that if anyone knew of property for sale in the area to please let the Parks and Recreation Department staff know about it. Mr. Hall explained that a lot of people in their area feel they have been denied their fair share of parkland.

Mr. Ehrler reported that the board will tour proposed tennis center sites at the meeting to be held Monday, September 10, 1979.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.